

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached two sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 6 and 11. These sheets, which include Figs. 6, 11, and 12, replace the original two sheets including Figs. 6, 11, and 12.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets (2)

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Figures 6 and 11 have been amended to correct informalities contained therein. Claims 1 and 3 have been amended to correct informalities contained therein. Claim 1 has also been amended to clarify certain language contained therein. No new matter has been added. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-3 remain pending. Reconsideration of this Application and entry of this Amendment are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated March 15, 2007, the drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.84(p)(4) because reference character “36” had been used to designate the stop and the guidewire lumen in the guide member. Figures 6 and 11 have been amended to delete reference character “36” that was erroneously pointing to passageway “136.”

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 3 were objected to for containing certain informalities. Claims 1 and 3 have been amended to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claims 1 and 3 be withdrawn.

Non-Statutory Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejection

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 2 were rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,905,477 (“the ‘477 patent”) in view of Fischell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,334,187). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites a catheter and guidewire exchange system that includes, *inter alia*, a guide member having an outer member and an inner member. As recited by claim 1, the outer member is selectively rotatable relative to the inner member. As conceded by the Examiner, the claims of the ‘477 patent do not disclose all of the features of claim 1 of the present application. The Examiner relies on Fischell et al. to make up for the deficiency.

However, Fischell et al. does not disclose or suggest a guide member having an outer member and an inner member, the outer member being selectively rotatable relative to the inner member, as recited by claim 1. As conceded by the Examiner at page 6 of the Office Action, the tube 48 of Fischell et al., which is what the Examiner has construed to be the “inner member,” is

fixed to the slide handle 30, which is what the Examiner has construed to be the “outer member.” As such, the slide handle of Fischell et al. is not selectively rotatable relative to the tube.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 2 of the present application are not obvious variations of claims 1 and 2 of the ‘477 patent. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1 and 2 be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

In the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Crittenden et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,988,356). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is discussed above. As recited by claim 1, the outer member is selectively rotatable relative to the inner member. Crittenden et al. does not disclose or suggest every feature of claim 1.

The tubular member 48 of Crittenden et al., which is what the Examiner has construed to be the “inner member,” is mounted securely within the bore 42 of the guide member 12. *See* Crittenden et al. at col. 5, lns. 35-40. As such, the guide member 12 is not selectively rotatable relative to the tubular member 48.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and the claims that depend from claim 1 are patentable over Crittenden et al., and respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Fischell et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 and Fischell et al. are discussed above. As discussed above, the slide handle of Fischell is not selectively rotatable relative to the tube, because as conceded by the Examiner, the tube is fixed to the slide handle. As such, Fischell et al. does not disclose or suggest every feature of claim 1.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes all the pending claims are in condition for allowance and should be passed to issue. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required under 37 C.F.R. 1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 01-2525. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would in any way expedite the prosecution of the application, please do not hesitate to call the undersigned at telephone (707) 543-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

/Catherine C. Maresh, Reg. No. 35,268/
Catherine C. Maresh
Registration No. 35,268
Attorney for Applicant

Medtronic Vascular, Inc.
3576 Unocal Place
Santa Rosa, CA 95403
Facsimile No.: (707) 543-5420